Remarks

In this response, no amendments have been presented

Claims 3-7, 9-11, 13-14, 18-20, 23, and 25-35 remain pending.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action claims 27, 29, 31-35, 3-4, 6-7, 13-14, 18, 23, and 28 are rejected under 35 § U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Blinn et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,897,622) (hereinafter "Blinn") in view of Nazem (U.S. Patent No. 5,983,227) (hereinafter "Nazem") and in view of Bijnagte (U.S. Patent No. 5,235,680) (hereinafter "Bijnagte") and further in view of Wolff (U.S. Patent No. 6,247,047) (hereinafter "Wolff").

Claim 27 recites an apparatus for the provisioning of information pages comprising:

> a storage device having stored therein a plurality of executable instructions that implements an information server for receiving a uniform resource locator (URL) comprising a server name immediately followed by a separator immediately followed by an identifier interpreted by the information server as a product identifier identifying a product, and in response, constructing and issuing one or more queries including the product identifier to retrieve information corresponding to the identified resource product and dynamically generating instructions to create the associated information page for the identified resource product for provisioning to a client; and
>
> a processor coupled to the storage device to execute the stored executable instructions.

In the Office Action, it is conceded that Blinn, Bijnagte, and Nazeem do not teach a product identifier immediately following a server name. However, the Office Action goes on to state that "Wolff teaches a URL banner with a server name (www.bannerbuy.com) with a unique product identifier immediately appended after said server and separator (wwww.bannerbuy.com/12345)..." and, therefore, it would have been obvious to apply this teaching to Blinn, providing Blinn the benefit of adaptation to various typical types of URL resource calls. The Applicants traverse this statement.

Wolff teaches that "embedded with banner **102** is the URL of host server **12** (e.g., www.bannerbuy.com") and a unique indicia (e.g., "12345")..." *Wolff*, column 8, lines 43-45 (underlining added). Thus the indicia is separate and distinct from the URL. This is further evidenced by Wolff's description of the embodiment associated with Figure 3. This description makes it clear that in response to the banner being selected "the user node **14** makes an TCP/IP request using the URL ("www.bannerbuy.com") embedded within banner **102** to contact host server **12** over Internet **16.**" *Id.*, column 8, lines 62-64 (underlining added). The indicia, introduced in the paragraph prior to this statement, is conspicuously absent from this definition of the URL. Once a connection with the host server **12** is established, the host server **12** generates a unique transaction ID, step **206**, and then receives the unique indicia, step **208**. *Id.*, column 8, line 65 *et seq*.

One skilled in the art interpreting these teachings would clearly understand Wolff to teach logic associated with the banner is designed to perform a connection operation with the server by transmitting a URL (including only the domain name) as an HTTP packet encapsulated in a TCP/IP packet for transport. Subsequent to establishing the connection, other HTTP packets providing the query information, i.e., the indicia, are sent to the server.

As can be seen in claim 27, on the other hand, the information server receives a URL comprising a server name immediately followed by a separator immediately followed by an identifier. A URL having this structure may be intuitively generated by a user looking for an information page on a known product from a known company. The information server of claim 27 is capable of receiving a URL, so generated, and extracting from it the information needed to construct appropriate queries and to dynamically generate an associated information page. This is true even if the associated information page did not exist (or did not exist at the location designated by the URL) prior to the information server receiving the URL.

It is these capabilities of the information server of claim 27 that distinguish it from, and provide various advantages over, the cited references (including Wolff). For

example, having the logic to perform these operations on the information server side (as is recited in claim 27) as opposed to the logic being tied to the banner (as taught by Wolff) allows users of client devices to construct and use intuitive URLs which, when placed in the address field of a conventional web browser, will be received and properly deconstructed by an information server enabled with teachings of the present invention.

Because Wolff does not teach an information server receiving a URL as recited in claim 27, this combination of asserted references fails to make claim 27, as a whole obvious.

Claims 29, 31-35, 3-4, 6-7, 13-14, 18, 23, and 28 depend from, or include limitations similar to claim 27. Therefore, these claims are patentable over these references for at least the reasons discussed above.

In the Office Action claims 9-11, 19-20 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blinn, Nazem, Bijnagte, Wolff and further in view of Anderson et al. (US Pat. No. 5,974,396) (hereinafter "Anderson").

These claims depend from, or include elements similar to, claim 27. As discussed above, the combination of Blinn, Nazem, Bijnagte, and Wolff does not make claim 27, as a whole obvious. Anderson fails to correct for the above noted deficiencies. Accordingly, these claims are also patentable over this asserted combination.

In the Office Action claim 5 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blinn, Nazem, Bijnagte, Wolff, and further in view of Kirkevold et al. (US Pat. No. 6,263,322) (hereinafter "Kirkevold").

Claim 5 depends from claim 27. As discussed above, the combination of Blinn, Nazem, Bijnagte, and Wolff does not make claim 27, as a whole obvious. Kirkevold fails to correct for the above noted deficiencies. Accordingly, this claim is also patentable over this asserted combination.

Conclusion

Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (503) 796-2972. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,

Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.

Dated: 11/16/2006

/Nathan R. Maki/
Nathan R. Maki
Reg. No. 51110

Pacwest Center, Suite 1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: 503-222-9981